

How best to engage warfighters/users in SE process throughout lifecycle (#16)

- Why is this an issue?
 - Stability in requirements
 - For warfighters to get what they want
- Barriers to engaging warfighters
 - A shift in warfighter to joint command rather than component/agencies
 - Resourcing warfighters for involvement
 - Technology transition
 - Lack of training of requirements writers
 - Solution-driven requirements
 - Relative roles of COCOMs vs Lead commands

How best to engage warfighters/users in SE process throughout lifecycle (#16)

- Recommendations/Solutions
 - Involve warfighters in SE forum
 - Dialogue instead of one-stop reviews
 - Involve technical personnel on warfighters' staff
 - Improve DoD assessment of technology maturity

Is the guidance on SEP content sufficient? (#17)

- Why is this an issue?
 - More work if SEMP already exists – true difference between SEP vs SEMP
 - Not tailored per life cycle
- Barriers
 - New requirement to Program

Is the guidance on SEP content sufficient? (#17)

- Recommendations/Solutions
 - Guidance should be clear on purpose: What vs How?
 - Tailoring:
 - To life cycle phases/Milestone A, B, C (Like JCIDS)
 - For business systems, COTS, SOS (vice straight weapon systems)
 - Show us a good one
 - PM should truly own SE approach for the Program

SEP Relationships (#18)

- Why is this an issue?
 - This is more than an SEP issue
 - Workload
- Barriers
 - New requirement to Program
 - Overlapping content among other docs and real program management tools - redundancy
- Recommendations/Solutions
 - SEP should be PM's contract on SE with OSD/MDA
 - Investigate methods to reduce workload